

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 28-32, 34-36 and 38 are pending in this application. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 28-32, 34-36 and 38 stand rejected. Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 28-32, 34-36 and 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. Publ. No. US 2007/0118645 to Suturs in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,295,556 to Roese et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In response, independent claim 1 has been further limited to “software stored in a memory of the electronic device that automatically initiates communication with a server of the electronic device to download new or updated software.” Independent claims 10 and 28 have been similarly limited. Software stored in a memory 210 of the electronic device 145 to achieve the desired functionality of the device 145 is discussed in paragraph [0029] of the specification. Moreover, “all communication with the server may be initiated automatically by the electronic device itself” (specification, par. [0051]). Finally, the downloading of new and updated software to the electronic device 145 is discussed in paragraph [0019] of the specification.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-18, 20, 28-32, 34-36 and 38 are now clearly differentiated over Studers and Roese et al. For example, Studers is merely directed to a system for preventing theft of monitored CE devices based upon their status as protected or unprotected. Similarly, Roese et

al. discloses a method of locating devices within a computer system based upon connection information.

Nowhere within Studers or Roese et al. is there any disclosure of any system that uses a first security system to detect theft of an electronic device, a second security system for detecting use of the electronic device in an unauthorized network or an electronic device that automatically initiates communication with a server of the electronic device to download new or updated software.

Since Studers is directed to a system where CE devices 10i merely monitor each other, Studers teaches away from a security system that monitors the presence of electronic devices and the where the electronic device downloads new and updated software independently of operation of the security system. Similarly, since Roese et al. is directed to detecting the location of an accessing party, Roese et al. teaches away from a from a security system that monitors the presence of electronic devices and where the electronic device downloads new and updated software independently of operation of the security system.

The Office Action admits that Suturs does not teach “a control causes the network interface to communicate the response to the security system as an encrypted message using an encryption code that is unique to the electronic device, wherein said message includes an address and an identifier associated with the electronic device and said control verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network based upon said address and said identifier and wherein said user interface configured to allow a user to arm and disarm building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN”, but goes on to assert that “It

would have been obvious . . . to include a control . . . and said control verifies that said electronic device is installed in an authorized network based upon said address and said identifier, since Roese states at column 6, line 56 to column 7, line 7 that providing such features allows for the tracking of stolen devices which allows recovery or at the very least disabling access to sensitive information” (Office Action of 7/15/09, pages 4-5, paragraphs 12 and 13). However, Roese et al. is merely directed to the physical location of stolen devices, not to the recognition of authorization to use the device in any given network. As such Roese et al. teaches away from the claimed invention.

The Office Action admits that “Suters and Roese does not disclose a user interface is configured to allow a user to arm and disarm building intrusion detection features separately from security features of said LAN”, but goes on to assert that “It would have been obvious . . . to provide an interface that arms/disarms a building intrusion detection system separately from the security features of a LAN, since one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the building security features are a separate system from the network security features thereby requiring two separate interfaces for each system” (Office Action of 7/15/09, page 5, paragraphs 15 and 16). However, if the concept were obvious, then the Examiner should have no trouble demonstrating references to such fact and the Examiner is hereby requested to do so as required by the MPEP.

Moreover, as would also be well known to those of skill in the art, building security features are not separate from network security features and would not require two separate interfaces for each systems. In this regard, the separate arming and disarming of intrusion

detection and LAN features is truly unique over the prior art. As such, the separate arming and disarming of the intrusion detection features separately from the security features of the LAN would not be obvious from Suters and Roese et al.

Since neither Studers or Roese et al. (and the combination of Studers and Roese et al.) teach or suggest these features, the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Primary Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the

unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. *(If filed by paper, a duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed).*

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ

By: 

Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

Paul M. Vargo
Registration No. 29,116

Dated: August 24, 2009

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500